

REMARKS

In this response, Claims 1-42 have been canceled without prejudice and new Claims 43-124 have been added. Thus, Claims 43-124 are now pending in this application. No new matter was added. Support for the new claims can be found at least on page 20, lines 1-23, page 21, lines 1-6, and page 22 of the Applicant's specification (the "Specification"), as originally filed.

The final Office Action issued by the Examiner on June 22, 2006 (the "Office Action") has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as not enabled; claims 1, 4, 10, 13-15, 20, 21, 24-27, 35-38, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Utsumi et al. (USPN 5,729,281) ("Utsumi") in view of Bigham et al. (USPN 5,740,075) ("Bigham"); claims 2 and 3 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Chen (USPN 5,699,105); claim 5 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Rakib (US Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0019984); claim 6 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Dunn (USPN 5,721,829); claim 7 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Fries (USPN 6,317,885); claims 8, 9, and 19 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Nikolich (US Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0073431); claim 11 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Ahmed (USPN 6,519,773); claim 17-18, 33-34, and 39 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Kitamura et al. (USPN 6,188,871); claim 12 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and DeRodeff (USPN 5,828,403); claim 16 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, Chen, and an article in IEEE Communications Magazine; claim 22 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Wunderlich (USPN 5,631,693); claim 23 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and McGowan (US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0018745); claims 28, 29, and 31 were rejected

under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, and Decker (USPN 6,009,465); claim 30 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, Decker, and Shekel (USPN 3,639,840); and claim 32 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsumi, Bigham, Decker, and Hoarty (USPN 5,220,420).

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 43-124

New Claims 43-124 are set forth herein and believed by Applicant to be distinguishable over the prior art. Specifically, Applicant believes that independent Claims 43 and 84 are distinguishable over the prior art of record, either individually or in combination, at least because Utsumi and Bigham do not disclose, teach, or suggest a method or system whereby a service module receives a request *via a two-way communications path* from a room interface unit to transmit at least one digital or analog video channel, and in response to the request, converts the channel from its frequency within a multiplexed channel signal to a predetermined frequency that corresponds to the room interface unit. Utsumi discloses a cable television system in which a channel selection signal is transmitted *via a one-way wireless communications path* from a subscriber device to a selective distribution station, so that the selection distribution station can select a channel to send to the subscriber device *via a one-way communications cable*. Utsumi, FIG. 3 and col. 10; lns. 23-26 (“In the selective distribution section 10₂, the receiving portion 150 receives the up-signal from the subscriber’s transmitting device 42₁ through the antenna 160....”). Notably, Utsumi fails to disclose a cable television system permitting communications via a two-way communications path. Similarly, Bigham discloses an access subnetwork controller for video dial tone networks that *is restricted to one-way communications* to local video access nodes (LVANS). Bigham, FIG. 6 and col. 43; lns. 59-63. Bigham thus fails to disclose a cable television system permitting communications via a two-way communications path.

Applicant further believes that independent Claims 63 and 104 are also distinguishable over the prior art of record, either individually or in combination, at least for the same reasons as

set forth regarding Claims 43 and 84 and further because Utsumi and Bigham do not disclose, teach, or suggest a method or system that *identifies, converts, and transmits* a digital or analog video channel within a multiplexed channel signal to a room interface unit. Utsumi and Bigham disclose a cable system and access subnetwork controller, respectively, that fail to transmit information identifying at least one digital video channel or at least analog video channel within a multiplexed channel signal. Utsumi and Bigham also fail to disclose a multiplexed channel signal that includes at least one digital video channel and at least one analog video channel, whereupon the at least one digital video channel or at least one analog video channel is provided to at least one of the plurality of room interface units at a predetermined frequency.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the allowance of all pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that the new claims successfully traverse the prior art of record and that the application is now in order for allowance. Applicant believes that the Examiner's other arguments not discussed above are moot in light of the above arguments, but reserves the later right to address these arguments. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. St. John-Larkin
Reg. No. 56,924

Date: July 16, 2007

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (303) 685-7419
Fax: (720) 904-6119
E-mail: larkind@gtlaw.com